

# THE SPIRIT OF DEMOCRACY.

A Family Newspaper--Devoted to Politics, Foreign and Domestic News, Literature, the Arts and Sciences, Education, Agriculture, Markets, Amusement, &c.

VOLUME XXII.

WOODSFIELD, MONROE COUNTY, OHIO, JANUARY 24, 1866.

NUMBER 47.

## THE SPIRIT OF DEMOCRACY.

Published Every Wednesday.

**TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:**  
Two dollars per annum, if paid in advance; and two dollars and fifty cents if not paid in advance.  
No paper will be discontinued, except at the option of the publisher, until all arrears are paid.

**JOB PRINTING**  
Executed with neatness and dispatch at this office, and at reasonable prices.

**TERMS OF ADVERTISING:**  
One square, three weeks.....\$2 00  
One square, six weeks.....3 00  
One square, nine weeks.....4 00  
One square, twelve months.....8 00  
One-half column, one year.....20 00  
One-half column, one year.....30 00  
One column, one year.....60 00  
Twelve lines, or less, will be charged as one square.

All legal advertisements will be charged by the line.  
Notices of the appointment of Admors, administrators, and Executors, also notices of attachment, must be paid in advance.  
Twenty-five per cent. additional will be charged on the price of job work if not paid in advance, and on advertising if not paid before taken out.

**The Law of Newspapers.**  
1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary, are considered as wishing to continue their subscription.  
2. If subscribers order the discontinuance of their newspapers, the publisher may continue to send them until all arrears are paid.  
3. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible till they have notified the publisher, and ordered their discontinuance.  
4. If subscribers remove to other places without informing the publishers, and the papers are sent to the former direction, they are held responsible.  
5. The courts have decided that refusing to take periodicals from the office, or removing and leaving them uncollected for, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

## Professional Cards.

W. H. FERGUSON, D.D.

CLINTON & FERGUSON

Wholesale Dealers in

Drugs, Paints, Varnishes,

Oil, DYE STUFFS,

PATENT MEDICINES,

Woodsfield, Ohio.

Sole agents for the unrivalled WHITE LEADS

"Blue," "St. Nicholas," and "Winsor,"

nov 29th.

**Dr. W. T. Sinclair**

Having resumed the Practice of Medicine, tenders his Professional services to the citizens of Woodsfield and vicinity.

Residence one door north of Druggs Store.

**EDWARD ARCHBOLD,**

Attorney at Law, Notary Public

AND

Military Claim Agent

WOODSFIELD, OHIO.

July 6, 1865.

**JAMES R. MORRIS, JOHN S. WAY**

**MORRIS & WAY,**

Attorneys & Counsellors

AT LAW,

Woodsfield, Monroe County, Ohio.

Office, over Walton's New Store.

April 20, 1864.

**J. O. AMOS, J. P. SPRIGGS**

**AMOS & SPRIGGS,**

Attorneys and Counsellors at Law,

WOODSFIELD, OHIO.

Office: Two doors north of the Drug Store or old Monroe House.

April 26, 1865.

**JACOB T. MORRILL,**

Attorney & Counsellor at Law

AND

**NOTARY PUBLIC.**

Clarington, Monroe County, Ohio.

Will promptly and faithfully attend to business entrusted to his care. Compromise and amicable adjustment always first sought, and litigation used only as the last resort.

Oct. 31, '60.

**Farrier, Lobenstein & Co.**

MAUFACTURERS,

Wholesale and Retail Dealers

IN BOOTS & SHOES,

CLARINGTON, OHIO.

French, Calf and Kid Boots and Shoes, Sewed and Pegged, constantly on hand and made to order. Parties are invited to call and examine their stocks and prices before purchasing elsewhere.

nov 8.

**WOODSFIELD MARBLE**

**WORKS.**

**D. Neuhaert & Co.**

WOODSFIELD, OHIO.

Prepared to furnish

TOMB STONES,

TABLE TOPS,

MANTLES,

and every thing else in the marble line. Shop one door south of Kirkbride's store.

D. NEUHART & CO.

June 18, 1860, 17.

## Poetry.

### THERE COMES A TIME.

There comes a time when we grow old,  
And like a sunset down the sea,  
Slope gradual, and the night winds cold  
Come whispering sad and chillingly;  
And locks are gray  
As winter's day,  
And eyes of saddest blue behold  
The lips of faded coral say,  
There comes a time when we grow old.

There comes a time when joyous hearts,  
Which leaped as leaps the laughing maid;  
Are dead in all save memory,  
A prisoner in his dungeon chain;  
And dawn of day  
Hath passed away,  
The noon hath into darkness rolled,  
And by the embers wan and gray,  
I hear a voice in whisper say,  
There comes a time when we grow old.

There comes a time when manhood's prime  
Is shrouded in the mist of years,  
And beauty, fading like a dream,  
Hath passed away in silent tears;  
And then how dark  
But oh, the spark  
That kindled youth to hues of gold,  
Still burns with clear and steady ray,  
And fond affections, lingering, say,  
There comes a time when we grow old.

There comes a time when laughing Spring  
And golden Summer cease to be,  
And we put on the Autumn robe  
To tread the last declivity;  
But now the slope,  
With rosy Hope,  
Beyond the sunset we behold,  
Another dawn with fairer light,  
While watchers whisper through the night  
There is a time when we grow old.

### THE LITTLE CHILDREN.

God bless the little children,  
We meet them everywhere;  
We hear their voices round our hearth,  
Their footsteps on the stair;  
Their kindly hearts are swelling o'er  
With mirthfulness and glee;  
God bless the little children,  
Wherever they may be.

We meet them 'neath each gipsy tent,  
With visage swarthy and dun,  
And eyes that sparkle as they glance,  
With roguery and fun;  
We find them fishing in the brook  
For minnows, with a pin,  
Or creeping through the hazel-brush  
The linnet's nest to win.

We meet them in the lordly hall,  
Their stately father's pride;  
We meet them in the poor man's cot—  
He hath no wealth beside;  
Along the city's crowded street—  
They hurl the hoop or ball;  
We find them 'neath the pauper's roof—  
The saddest sight of all.

For there they win no father's love,  
No mother's tender care,  
Their only friend, the God above,  
Who hears the orphan's prayer;  
But dressed in silks or draped in rags,  
In childish grief or glee,  
God bless the little children,  
Wherever they may be.

**SHUT IN WHEAT AND HOW TO PREVENT IT.**—Take one pound of blue oil of vitriol—dissolve it in two or three quarts of boiling hot water in some earthen vessel. Then put it in a pail and fill with cold water. Now take ten bushels of seed wheat, on the barn floor, and sprinkle this solution all over it, and shovel it thoroughly, so that every kernel is wet, and in two or three hours it is ready to sow. You may keep it longer just as well, if you dry it and keep it from heating.

**Black boy to returned soldier.**—"Black your boots, sir? make 'em shine?" Looking at his unpolished 'gun-boots' in a contemplative way, the war-veteran replied, "Well, I don't care if you do—fall in promptly though." The urban gazed a moment at the soldier, and then, turning to a comrade near by, shouted out, "I say, Bill, lend us a hand, won't you? I've got an army contract."

**Joe and Bill Fenton went to New Orleans with a flat boat of corn.** Joe wrote to his father thus: "No Orleans, June 5.—Dear dad mark it dull and corn is mighty low and Bill is dead."

**Mrs. Partington said she did not marry her second husband because she loved the male sex, but just because he was the size of her first protector, and could wear out his old clothes.**

**What is the difference between a honeycomb and a honeymoon?** A honeycomb consists of a number of small "cells," and a honeymoon consists of one great "sell."

**"Do you like codfish balls, Mr. Wiggins?"** Mr. Wiggins, hesitatingly, "I really don't know, Miss; I don't recollect attending one."

**Love in France is a comedy,** in England a tragedy, in Italy an opera, in Germany a melo drama, and in America a matter of fact.

**KINDNESS and cheerfulness can remove more than half the wrinkles out of the forehead of age.**

## LECTURE

DELIVERED BY

GEN. GEORGE W. MORGAN,

BEFORE THE

Franklin Democratic Association.

IN COLUMBUS,

On Saturday Evening, Jan. 6, 1866.

[Concluded.]

### THE DEBT OF ENGLAND.

But who so blind as to be deceived?—Have we not before us the record of the funding system of Great Britain? Do we not know that for two hundred years that nation has never been free from debt? and hence her two million paupers, and her thirty thousand owners of her soil? And yet, this is the model followed by those who have ruled, and who would have ruled our country, had it not been for the indomitable courage, unflinching energy and patriotism of our people.

At the close of the reign of Charles 2d, the British debt only amounted to six hundred and sixty-four thousand two hundred and sixty-three pounds sterling money, but by the year 1691, it had augmented to three million pounds; and the war with France, which commenced six years afterward, increased the debt to fourteen millions, at which figure it remained for three years, when the war of the Spanish succession increased it to thirty-four millions. And the Spanish war of the year 1718 augmented the debt to fifty-four million pounds, equal to hundred and fifty-one million four hundred and sixty thousand dollars; when the ministry of Robert Walpole, sanguine of success, determined to pay off the debt. But, although favored by eighteen years of uninterrupted peace, it was only reduced eight million pounds, and equal to thirty-eight million seven hundred and twenty thousand dollars. And the wars of the Right of Search with Spain, and of the Austrian succession, left a debt in 1748, of seventy-five million pounds sterling; which, for a period of seventy years, put an end to all theories as to the payment of the national debt, although it then only amounted to three hundred and sixty-three million dollars, or about one-third the sum of our liquidated debt. After a short respite, the seven years' war broke out, which swelled the English debt to one hundred and fifty million pounds sterling. An interval of thirteen years of peace followed, which was succeeded by the seven years' war against the American colonies, which left the debt at two hundred and forty million pounds. After ten years of repose, the wars inaugurated by the French revolution commenced, and after twenty years of conflict, Great Britain found herself with a debt of eight hundred and sixty million pounds sterling! British statesmen began to be alarmed at the danger of a general bankruptcy which might sweep away the British throne and aristocracy, and during a period of forty years, England indulged in the novelty of peace, and reduced her debt to seven hundred and sixty million pounds; when the allied war against Russia again swelled it to eight hundred and five million pounds, at about which figure it now stands.

Here, then, citizens, in this mirror of the British funding system, we can see reflected the fate of our own country.

### THE NATION'S FAITH.

Reputation is an evil which all desire to see averted, and should such a calamity ever befall our country, it will be solely owing to unequal, and unjust, because unequal, taxation.

"When national debts," says Adam Smith, "have accumulated to a certain degree, there is scarcely a single instance of their having been fairly and completely paid. The liberation of the public revenue, if it had ever been brought about, has always been brought about by a bankruptcy, sometimes by an avowed one, but always by a pretended payment."

"The Romans, at the end of the first Punic war, reduced the As, the standard coin, from twelve ounces of copper to contain only two ounces. The law which enacted it, was, like all other laws relating to coin, introduced and carried the Assembly of the people by a bribe, and was probably a very popular law." "In the course of the second Punic war, the As was reduced to the twenty-fourth part of its original value." "And even," says Smith, "the enormous debt of Great Britain might be paid in this manner."

"Nations," he says, "have sometimes for the same purpose adulterated their coin—that is, have mixed a greater quantity of alloy with it."

"When King John of France, in order to pay his debts, adulterated his coin, all the officers of his mint were sworn to secrecy. And in the end of the reign of Henry the 8th, and in the beginning of the reign of Edward the 6th, the English coin was not only raised in its denomination, but adulterated in its standard. And the like frauds were practiced in Scotland during the minority of James the 6th, and have been occasionally practiced in most other countries."

And it is a remarkable fact, frequently illustrated in history, that the blotting out of a nation's debt does not materially prejudice a nation's credit. In treating of this subject, Jean Baptiste Say, in his admirable work on the science of Political Economy, remarks that: "The monstrous breach of faith on the part of the French Government in 1721, in regard to its paper money, and the Mississippi share holders did not prevent the ready

negotiation of a loan of two million livres in 1833; nor did the bankrupt measures of the Abbe Feollet in 1772, prevent the negotiation of fresh loans in 1773, and every subsequent year."

### TAXATION.

Then, citizens, inasmuch as the National debt is to be perpetual, and as it bears compound usury, it behooves us to consider the means by which the usury can be paid.

Heavy taxation is the logical and inevitable consequence of a heavy debt. But what is taxation? It is the compulsory taking from individuals, a portion of their property to be consumed for public purposes. Hence by the payment of the tax, the individual becomes that much poorer, and by the consumption of the tax when paid, the State becomes that much poorer. The dollar continues to exist, but the bushel of wheat, the yard of stuff, or the pound of powder which the dollar purchased, are absolutely consumed and destroyed. Money is the circulating measure of value, and the same dollar by the process of circulation may purchase products to the value of several hundred dollars, and ceaselessly continue to purchase an indefinite number of other values; but the flour, the gunpowder and clothing, when eaten, burned or worn out, are absolutely consumed and lost forever—that is, the nation is exactly that much poorer than it was before. And since March 1861, the United States have actually consumed and blotted out of existence, property equal to nearly one-third of the real and personal wealth owned by the Government and people of the United States, without taking into account the losses caused by the ravages of war.

### INCOME TAX.

Political economists advise the levying of one of the following kinds of tax, and to exempt from taxation all other objects:

- 1st. Either on capital, as in Ohio.
- 2d. On income.
- 3d. On Consumption—all that is eaten worn or used.
- 4th. On all kinds of legal forms and proceedings, notes, bills, &c., &c.

Prior to the inauguration of President Lincoln, with the exception of the sales of public land, and the postoffice, the revenue of the Federal Government, principally accrued from an indirect tax, called a tariff, on the consumption of imported articles; and it was so light that the people did not feel that a tax was levied. But now we are taxed on incomes; we are taxed on consumption; we are taxed on legal proceedings; and our rulers have copied from England the long detected, and justly odious stamp tax, and there are thirty-five hundred specific articles upon which there are different grades of taxation. Nor is this all; we are taxed three times at least, on every article we wear. On the leather of your boots are made, there is a tax before it leaves the tanner, who adds the tax to the value of the leather, before he sells it to the bootmaker; and when the boots are made they are taxed six per cent. on their value, which tax is added by the bootmaker to the price of the boots, which have already been taxed once; and when you buy the boots, the seller is taxed on the profit he makes on them, which tax is also added to the price of the boots, and thus on the same pair of boots, you have been taxed three times, which, in a degree, explains the reason for the high price you paid for them. But although in the price of the boots, you paid the tax assessed on the tanner and bootmaker, they also are sufferers; for the higher the price of boots, or hats, or coats, or dresses for your wives and daughters, the fewer of these articles will be sold; but the evil will not be greatly felt until our currency is reduced from seven to three or four hundred million dollars, when a dollar in silver—that is, when the people feel that a paper dollar is really worth a dollar, they will take care of it accordingly.

It seems to me, citizens, and I would be glad to learn your opinion relative to what I am about to say—it does seem to me that taxation should be equitable; that is, each citizen should be taxed according to his means; and if I am in error, I trust that I may be corrected. For example, where two persons have the same means, it appears to me that they ought to be taxed equally. But suppose that one of them is worth twice as much as the other, would it be just to make the poorer man pay as high a tax as the man who is worth two dollars to his one? You say that it would be unjust to do so; and I believe that your judgment is right. Well, then, let us suppose that Mr. Jones, who has no business or profession, and who lives without labor, has a wife and family, and is possessed of an income of sixteen hundred dollars, accruing from mortgage securities; and he has a neighbor, Mr. Smith, who owns no property, but has a wife and family, and is also possessed of an income of sixteen hundred dollars, the product of his industry. Now these two men have the same income, and pay the same amount of tax to support the Federal Government; but what is their relative situation? Jones is worth over twenty six thousand dollars secured by mortgage, which yields him, without labor, sixteen hundred dollars a year; while Smith owns no property, whatever, and his income, which is the product of his toil, not only depends upon his health, but also on his being able to procure employment, which may be lost or decreased by accidents over which he has no control. And while the family of Jones, in the case of his death, are still secure in the income of sixteen hundred a year, the family of Smith would be left in a state of destitution, should he die. Can it be just, then, citizens, that Smith, who is only worth one dollar, should pay as heavy

a tax as Jones, who is worth twenty-six thousand dollars? And yet, such is the law of Congress.

There is another fact connected with the income tax, to which I wish to invite your attention. The tax on the income of one year cannot, and is not assessed until the following year; for until the close of the year, the amount of the income is not known. But suppose that during the income year, the family of Smith was afflicted with sickness, which caused him to exhaust his entire income; and that during a portion of the following year, the same in which the tax has to be paid, he is unable to obtain employment—can you tell me, citizens, where he is to get money to pay his last year's tax? His family must be fed, and housed, and clothed; and he is without employment, with only one dollar in his pocket; and yet the law requires him to pay as heavy a tax as Jones, who is worth twenty-six thousand times more money! Can it be possible, my friends, that such a law can be just?

But again, let us suppose that two other members of the Jones and Smith families to have equal incomes resulting from their labor, but Jones owns a furnished house in which he and his family reside, worth one thousand dollars, while Smith lives in a rented house, and is only worth one hundred dollars. These families live up to their incomes, and inasmuch as the incomes are equal, each, by the law, is required to pay the same amount of tax—say fifty dollars. The moment before the tax was paid, Jones was worth ten hundred and Smith one hundred dollars—that is, Jones was worth ten times as much as Smith; but each was compelled to use fifty dollars of his property to pay his tax, thus reducing the wealth of Jones to nine hundred and fifty; and of Smith to fifty dollars. That is Jones paid his tax with one-twentieth of what he was worth, while it required Smith to pay one-half of all he owned. Before the tax was paid, Jones was worth ten times as much as Smith, but the moment after the tax was paid he was worth nineteen times as much—that is, after the tax was paid Jones was worth nine hundred and fifty, while Smith was reduced to fifty dollars.

I fear, citizens, that I will weary your patience; but as the subject is an important one, I indulge me in one further illustration. I will again take my examples from those large and worthy families of Jones and Smith. The two gentlemen have each a capital of forty thousand dollars in money. Jones invests his money in State stocks, rides a fancy horse, smokes good cigars, and without risk or labor, has an income of twenty-four hundred dollars. On the other hand, Smith, who is a public spirited man, full of energy and industry, assumes the risks of trade, and establishes a foundry or a factory, and the reward of his enterprise and toil is an income of forty-eight hundred dollars, although his capital was only equal to that of Jones; and yet the law requires him to pay double the amount of tax paid by Jones. That is, the law imposes a penalty upon industry and enterprise, and bestows a reward upon idleness. Is this either wise or just?

**TWO GOVERNMENTS TO SUPPORT.**  
From the very nature of our institutions, citizens, we are taxed to support two Governments at the same time, both in debt. It is true, as you all remember, that prior to 1861, the affairs of the Federal Government were so economically administered, that the people in those happy, prosperous and peaceful days, only felt the Federal Government in the blessings it bestowed upon them. They knew that there was an army and a navy, but no one felt that a dollar was taken from his pocket to pay for either. Cherish the memory of those bygone days, citizens, for never again will you see them return. Nevertheless, we have a duty to perform, and it will be becoming and decent to discharge it like men.

**THE BOND-OWNER AND THE BONDMAN.**  
But, citizens, what will you say of a law which exempts one man from taxation, who is worth one hundred thousand, while it taxes another man, who is only worth one hundred dollars? The act of Congress passed June 30, 1864, declares that all bonds and other United States securities, shall be exempt from taxation, by or under any Municipal or State law. Time will not permit me to discuss, and by discussion demonstrate the unconstitutionality of the law; but I ask, are not all the citizens of Ohio alike protected in person and property by the laws? Why then should not all contribute to their support? I do not know, citizens, who are bond-owners in your city, and hence the remarks that I am about to apply to a class and not to any particular individual. Well, then, your fellow citizen, Mr. Z., who owns one hundred thousand dollars in bonds, on which he receives what is equivalent to 10 per cent. interest in greenbacks. And when Z. bought his bonds, he only paid fifty thousand dollars in the operation. But as his original investment was only fifty thousand dollars, and as he receives six per cent. in gold on one hundred thousand, it follows that he gets twelve per cent. in gold, or twenty per cent. in paper money on the amount of his original investment, and yet he is not taxed for State and local purposes. But while he reaps his harvest of gold interest, and contributes nothing to society, he insists that you shall place a gas post in front of his house, so that he may go to and from his luxurious home in safety; that you shall keep well paved streets for his convenience, and maintain a well regulated police to guard his person from assault and his house from burglary; and he requires you to keep up courts of law, and pay the salaries of the

judges, so that he may have you tried and punished, should you have the misfortune to offend him. And finally, citizens, inasmuch as you make the roads, and he drives over them; as you put up gas lamps, and he sees by them; as you pay for maintaining courts, and he brings suit in them; as you build jails and penitentiaries to confine persons who steal his property; and lunatic asylums for his care and restoration, should he become insane; and dumb and blind asylums for the benefit of his children, should they become deprived of sight or hearing; inasmuch as you do all this, while he contributes nothing—not a farthing of his bond-money—why, he naturally concludes, citizens, that you ought to pay his taxes and educate his children; and his conclusion must be just, for you do both without a murmur. And yet, citizens, you have the bad taste to boast that you have descended from ancestors who compelled the British Government to repeal the odious stamp act, and then made war because England insisted on levying a tax of three pence on a pound of tea. Is it not strange, citizens, that we do not blush with shame while we think of our condition, and contemplate the deeds of our sires!

What, citizens, do you propose to do? Are you so weary of liberty that you are content to become slaves? If not, then let us all cease our puerile bickerings about party, and think and act alone for our country—for our liberties. Do this, and there is yet hope, for he never can become a slave who is worthy of being free.

### THE SOLDIER AND THE BOND-OWNER.

When volunteers could no longer be obtained, all citizens between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, who were not rich enough to procure substitutes, were liable to be compelled to join the army. For the poor man, there was no hope—no remedy. No matter how large or how destitute might be his family, the husband and father was forced to confront the perils of war. The battle fought, the victory won, peace restored, the soldier returns home maimed and helpless. Perchance he has a small house, a cow, two hogs, and a few chickens, and these are the amount of his worldly store. Is this returned soldier exempt from taxation? No. Near by there lives a soldier's widow. Is she exempt from taxation? No. And further on resides a family of orphans; the father was killed in battle, and the wife and mother died of a broken heart. There! behold them, in this cold, bleak night. See those desolate ones cluster 'round the dying embers upon the hearth-stone. Are they exempt from taxation? No, my countrymen, no! Their father slumbers in a soldier's grave, with his country's flag around him; but his orphans—look! The tax-gatherer is after them! Then, in Heaven's holy name, if those orphans are not worthy of exemption, who are? who? Why ask the question? Is not the rich?

**BOND-OWNER?**  
Money was also needed, and none but the rich had money to lend—and be it here said in all justice, that here and there among the rich, there were noble and generous spirits who faced the storm of war. But did the Government compel the rich to lend their money, as the poor were forced to go to war? No; but the money-lenders said to the Government, "We see your distress—we know that unless you obtain money, the Union will be dissolved—but you can only have our money on certain conditions. You must pay us—must be paid in gold—it must be paid semi-annually—we must be secured by a mortgage on all the property in the United States, and finally, you must give us your bond that in all future time, neither we, nor our children shall be liable to State or Municipal taxation. Grant our terms and exist—refuse them, and perish! The Government yielded; the bond was signed—a moneyed aristocracy was created in our midst; and to-day it controls both branches of Congress, and the Legislatures of every Northern and Western State.

In his great speech on "Constitution with America," Edmund Burke remarked, "It has happened, you know, sir, that the great contests for freedom in this country, were, from the earliest times, chiefly upon this question of taxation." But of the many examples which might be cited, I will only refer to two.

The House of Commons, alarmed at the usurpations of Charles I, limited his supplies. In the exercise of his prerogative, the King dissolved Parliament, and in violation of the British Constitution, by proclamation, based on the plea of necessity, levied taxes. And in order to give color of law to his usurpations, he called upon the judges to say "whether in case of necessity, for the defense of the kingdom, he might not impose taxation, and whether he was not the sole judge of the necessity." "And these guardians of the law," says Hume, "with great complaisance replied that in case of necessity he might levy taxes, and that he was the sole judge of the necessity." A new Parliament was held and dissolved, and new taxes were levied by force of the King's proclamation. John Hampden—a name which must ever be revered, while liberty is cherished—refused to pay the tax, and became the champion of the British Constitution. His trial roused England from her lethargy, and inaugurated the revolution which brought the head of Charles to the block; founded the Commonwealth; set aside the judgment against Hampden, and caused his unworthy judges in their turn to be arrested

and arraigned for their violation of the Constitution.

I observe, citizens, that you already anticipate the other instance to which I am about to refer.

Great Britain claimed the right to levy taxes upon our fathers, while she denied to them the right of representation. Remonstrance after remonstrance went up from the colonies; and within two years from the enactment of the odious tax-law, it was repealed, save as to the reserved tax of three pence on a pound of tea. The tax in amount was insignificant, but it was the assertion of a right which our forefathers denied to exist. Vessels laden with tea arrived in Boston harbor, and a party of citizens, disguised as Indians, boarded them and threw the tea overboard. The port of Boston was declared to be closed, and colonists were arrested and sent over to England for trial.

When intelligence of these wrongs reached Virginia, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Richard Henry and Francis Lightfoot Lee, proposed a Union of the colonies for the defense of Massachusetts harbor, and a party of citizens, disguised as Indians, boarded them and threw the tea overboard. The port of Boston was declared to be closed, and colonists were arrested and sent over to England for trial.

In those days, there lived in Massachusetts a race of giants, the last of whom died out with Daniel Webster and Rufus Choate. Alas, for Massachusetts, her greatness and her glory lie buried in the graves of her Adamses, her Hancocks, her Otises, and her Winthrops, her Websters and her Choates. Alas, for the State once made eminent by her statesman now rendered infamous by her demagogues!

In the hour of peril, Virginia went to the rescue of Massachusetts, and a Virginia drove the British from the town of Boston. Such was then the attitude of Virginia to Massachusetts—what to-day is the attitude of Massachusetts to Virginia?

I need not say to you, citizens, that our sires were attached to Great Britain; as the home of their fathers; but they regarded an unjust tax, however light, as the badge of serfdom, and petition and remonstrance having failed, they went to war in vindication of a principle, and triumphed.

**OUR COUNTRY.**  
As I commenced my remarks by speaking of the peril which threatens our institutions, from the excessive party spirit, so will I conclude them.

In the solemn and impressive language of Daniel Webster, we have, to-day, an organized party within the Government, at war with the very elements upon which it is based.

It, then, depends upon you, my countrymen—as the people in the largest, noblest sense—it is for you to determine whether party is dearer than country; whether prejudice is superior to patriotism.

If the people have the intrepidity to discard party, and take the stand by the side of our patriotic President, then our free institutions may yet be saved; but if party has become a dearer object to Americans, than country, then, indeed, they are hopeless lost.

**The Dead-Letter Office at Washington.**

A correspondent of the Boston Evening Gazette says:

"The dead-letter office is one of the curiosities of Washington to the stranger; but to those engaged in it is a terrible drudgery. The opening, examining and sorting of fourteen thousand five hundred letters every six hours, involves much hard labor; but it must be done, for there are four-and-a-half millions of dead letters come to the office every year. All that are signed are returned to the writers; but so many are written by 'Your affectionate Adie,' or 'Your loving Son,' that each clerk has a huge two-bushel basket by